

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract**

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar as well as address the objection identified on page 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, as requested in the objection, the abstract has been amended to conform to the standards set forth in the MPEP. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection to the abstract is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

### **II. Amendments to the Claims**

Claims 2-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1 and 6-10 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

### **III. 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roddy et al. (U.S. 2003/021463). Further, claims 3 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Roddy, Deter (U.S. 6,309,072), Chaudhari et al. (U.S. 2003/0210371), and Okazaki et al. (U.S. 6,764,183). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claim 1 and claims 6-10 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a two-dimensional image display device, wherein: (1) a center wavelength of a blue light is not less than 420 nm and is not larger than 455 nm; (2) a center wavelength of a red light is not less than 635 nm and is not larger than 655 nm; (3) a center wavelength of a green light is not less than 505 nm and is not larger than 550 nm; (4) a ratio of the blue light to the green light during a white display is not less than 0.5:1 and is not larger than 4:1; and (5) a ratio of the red light to the green light during the white display is not less than 0.4:1 and is not larger than 1.3:1.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges

that Roddy fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (4) and (5), as now recited in amended independent claim 1. In light of the above this rejection relies on Deter for teaching the above-mentioned features which are admittedly lacking from Roddy.

However, Deter teaches a blue/green ratio of 0.712:1, wherein a wavelength of the blue light is 445 nm and the wavelength of the green light is 532 nm, and teaches a red/green ratio of 1.05:1, wherein the wavelength of the red light is 632 nm and the wavelength of the green light is 532 nm (see col. 8, lines 42-48).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Deter teaches that the wavelength of the red light is 632 nm when the blue/green and red/green ratios of 0.712:1 and 1.05:1, respectively, are satisfied, but fails to disclose or suggest that a center wavelength of a red light is not less than 635 nm and is not larger than 655 nm, when a ratio of the blue light to the green light during a white display is not less than 0.5:1 and is not larger than 4:1, and when a ratio of the red light to the green light during the white display is not less than 0.4:1 and is not larger than 1.3:1, as required by claim 1.

In other words, it is apparent that Deter teaches away from the wavelength of the red light being between 635 nm and 655 nm, when the blue/green ratio is between 0.5:1 and 4:1 and the red/green ratio is between 0.4:1 and 1.3:1, as required by claim 1, because Deter requires that the wavelength of the red light is 632 nm when the blue/green and red/green ratios fall within the range of blue/green and red/green ratios required by claim 1.

Therefore, it is submitted that the disclosure of Deter is not compatible with the teachings of Roddy (i.e., the specific wavelengths) for the purpose of disclosing or suggesting the limitations required by claim 1.

Thus, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 6-10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Roddy, Deter, Chaudhari and Okazaki.

Please note that one of the results of the structure required by claim 1 is that the specific wavelength limitations and the specific ratio limitations provide an increased level of luminescence suppression. In light of the discussion above, the combination of Roddy, Deter, Chaudhari and Okazaki do not provide the above-mentioned result of the structure required by claim 1, because Deter teaches away from the use of the specific wavelengths and the specific ratios required by claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Roddy, Deter, Chaudhari and Okazaki or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Roddy, Deter, Chaudhari and Okazaki to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 6-10 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Ken'ichi KASAZUMI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.12.30 16:43:16 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 30, 2008